

**SECRET**

## Security Information

## Summary of Interviews with Consumers and Instructors

Opinions and Attitudes of Consumers.

The majority of users of training evaluation reports view the reports as one of a number of factors to be considered in determining personnel decisions such as assignment, transfer, and promotion recommendation. Some consumers give as much or more weight to the comments and evaluations made by the instructors as they do to the report of academic achievements while others pay only slight attention to these remarks because of their "subjective" nature. None of the consumers, however, suggested the elimination of trait ratings and reports of observed behavior. They recognize the limitations of the basic courses as evaluative situations and are aware of the difficulties of making valid appraisals of personal characteristics in such settings. Few decisions, therefore, are made on the basis of training evaluation reports alone, but any information which is provided concerning the student's mental abilities, his behavior and his personality would be welcome. Supervisors in DD/A and DD/I offices, on the whole, expressed greater interest in the evaluation of professional skills as required in report writing and research, while DD/P supervisors placed greater relative stress upon the appraisal of personality characteristics.

In order to understand and interpret evaluation reports correctly, most consumers expressed a desire for more detailed information concerning course objectives, procedures, and opportunities for individual contact and observation. Precise meanings of grades and adjectival ratings and the establishing of norms would be desirable. Some degree of uniformity in the evaluative procedures and reports would also make for greater consistency in standards and in interpretation from course to course and from class to class.

Opinions and Attitudes of Instructional Staff.

Instructors and training officials were concerned about improving the quality of their evaluations. They expressed a desire for more precise information about the requirements of the consumers in order that they might make their evaluations and ratings more meaningful. They were also concerned, however, about being required to make judgments in which they had little confidence in situations where there were limited opportunities for observing students. For some courses, instructors felt that grading and rating the results of subject-matter tests was all that could be done, while in others some evaluation of skill and facility of performance and appraisal of personality characteristics could be made. In all areas, however, some professional assistance would be welcome, for example, on such problems as constructing tests, designing rating procedures, etc.

For the BIC(CS), which will be a lecture course, contact between instructor and student will be minimal. Academic grades based on objective tests

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

Security Information

will be reported and any unusually outstanding performance, either good or poor, will be noted. In addition, other unusual behavior on the part of a student will be commented upon. Plans for BIC(Sup) are still awaiting approval, but the training evaluation procedures will probably be similar to those for BIC(CS). The BIC(I) provides some opportunities for contact between students and instructors. Therefore, in addition to academic ratings, some personality appraisal is considered feasible.

**SECRET**

Security Information

~~S-E-C-R-E-T~~

Approved For Release 2003/08/27 : CIA-RDP57-00012A000600220007-6

TRAINING EVALUATION

This evaluation is based on a course of \_\_\_\_\_ weeks duration in which there were \_\_\_\_\_ students. In interpreting evaluations, the amount of opportunity for observation of individual students should be considered. This evaluation should not be used as a sole or even major basis for action. It is primarily intended to furnish information on how well the student learned the subject matter or skills taught. Secondly, incidental observations of interest are reported. These have significance only as they are related to other information. Unless otherwise stated, performance is evaluated in terms of standards set by the instructors or in relationship to performance of those who have or who are taking the course. The evaluation is without regard to position, grade, or length of service in the Agency. These factors must be taken into account in interpreting the report.

Section I: Identifying Information

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Course and Inclusive Dates: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Birth: \_\_\_\_\_ E.O.D: \_\_\_\_\_ Grade or Rank: \_\_\_\_\_ Days Absent: \_\_\_\_\_

Position: \_\_\_\_\_ Office: \_\_\_\_\_

Section II: Observations of Attitudes or Behavioral Characteristics.

Directions: For each of the following, please circle the appropriate response.

- |                                                                                                                |        |                                                                                                                                                                        |        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| A. Did you observe any incidents that suggested this person lacked motivation for an Agency career?            | Yes No | the course?                                                                                                                                                            | Yes No |
| B. Did you observe any incidents that led you to question this person's security mindedness?                   | Yes No | E. Did you observe any incidents in which this student interfered with instructional and classroom activities?                                                         | Yes No |
| C. Did you observe any incidents which indicated that this person has difficulty in getting along with others? | Yes No | F. Did you observe any outstanding trait or characteristic that you believe should be taken into account either in dealing with this person or in planning his career? | Yes No |
| D. Did you observe any incidents which led you to believe that this person had an unfavorable attitude toward  |        | Do not answer 'yes' unless the person is well described by the trait. If 'yes' explain fully below.                                                                    |        |

Please explain more fully if answer to any of the above questions is 'yes.'

Section III: Knowledge

Subject

Centile Standing<sup>1</sup>

Instructor's Rating<sup>2</sup>

Over-all Academic Evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_

1. Based on \_\_\_\_\_

2. Scale used: Failure, Poor, Satisfactory, Excellent, Superior.

~~S-E-C-R-E-T~~

Approved For Release 2003/08/27 : CIA-RDP57-00012A000600220007-6

**S-E-C-R-E-T**

Approved For Release 2003/08/27 : CIA-RDP57-00012A000600220007-6

**Section IV. Skills**

<u>Skill</u>	<u>Instructor's Evaluation Based On:</u>			<u>Associates' Evaluation</u>
	<u>Course Instruction</u>		<u>Incidental Observation</u>	
	<u>Centile<sup>1</sup> Standing</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Rating</u>	
Ability to write reports				
Facility in oral expression				
Other:				
1. Based on		2. Based on:		

**Section V. Attitudes and Personality Traits**

**Explanation:** The distribution of scores for the class is shown for each trait or attitude rated. Red X's are for the instructors' ratings, black X's are for associates' ratings. The student's mark is circled.

<u>Trait or Attitude</u>	<u>RATING:</u>	<u>Failure</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>Superior</u>

**Section VI. Adjusted Overall Evaluation**

**Directions:** In terms of all factors observed during the course and taking into account this person's age, experience in Agency, grade, and general area of work, indicate, by placing an X in the appropriate box, your judgment of his performance in the course.

1. He was inadequate in his performance . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
2. He was barely adequate in his performance and performed acceptably only  
in a limited range of assignments . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
3. He performed acceptably, but was barely adequate in some respects . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
4. He was a typically effective student who performed in a competent,  
dependable manner . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
5. He performed at a high level of competence . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
6. He performed at an extremely high level that only a few students have  
surpassed . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_
7. He performed at a level of competence that excelled all other students  
who have taken this course . . . . . \_\_\_\_\_

**Section VII. Comments**

Report here general information, extenuating circumstances, or recommendations not included elsewhere in this report:

(If more space is needed attach standard size sheet.)  
Approved For Release 2003/08/27 : CIA-RDP57-00012A000600220007-6

**S-E-C-R-E-T**

Chief Instructor